

Initial non-repetitive complexity of infinite words

Jeremy Nicholson¹, Narad Rampersad^{*,2}

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Winnipeg, 515 Portage Avenue,
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 2E9 (Canada)*

Abstract

The *initial non-repetitive complexity function* of an infinite word $\mathbf{x}$ (first introduced by Moothathu) is the function of n that counts the number of distinct factors of length n that appear at the beginning of $\mathbf{x}$ prior to the first repetition of a length- n factor. We examine general properties of the initial non-repetitive complexity function, as well as obtain formulas for the initial non-repetitive complexity of the Thue–Morse word, the Fibonacci word and the Tribonacci word.

Key words: initial non-repetitive complexity, Thue–Morse word, Fibonacci word, Tribonacci word, squarefree word

1. Introduction

For any infinite word $\mathbf{x}$, there is an associated *complexity function* $c_{\mathbf{x}}$ defined as follows: the quantity $c_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$ is the number of distinct factors of length n that appear in the word $\mathbf{x}$. Properties of the complexity function for various classes of infinite words have been extensively studied [6, Chapter 4]. Several variants of the complexity function have been introduced and studied, such as *palindrome complexity* [1] or *abelian complexity* [19]. In this paper we study the *initial non-repetitive complexity function*, which was first introduced by Moothathu

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: jnich998@hotmail.com (Jeremy Nicholson),
n.rampersad@uwinnipeg.ca (Narad Rampersad)

¹The author was supported by an NSERC USRA.

²The author is supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant.

[17].

We define the *initial non-repetitive complexity function* $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$ for an infinite word $\mathbf{x}$ by

$$\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) = \max\{m \in \mathbb{N} : x_i \cdots x_{i+n-1} \neq x_j \cdots x_{j+n-1} \text{ for every } i, j \text{ with } 0 \leq i < j \leq m-1\}.$$

In other words $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$ is the maximum number of length- n factors that we see when reading $\mathbf{x}$ from left to right prior to the first repeated occurrence of a length- n factor.

Moothathu posed the following question in his paper: Is it possible to get some idea about the topological entropy of a dynamical system by looking only at initial segments of the orbit of some point? As an attempt to answer this question, he introduced the quantity

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)}{n},$$

which he called “non-repetitive complexity”. In this paper, we will use the term *non-repetitive complexity* for the following function:

$$\text{nrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) = \max\{m \in \mathbb{N} : \exists k, x_i \cdots x_{i+n-1} \neq x_j \cdots x_{j+n-1} \text{ for every } i, j \text{ with } k \leq i < j \leq k+m-1\}.$$

This paper is primarily about the function $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$. Although Moothathu introduced the concept, he did not explicitly compute this function for any particular infinite words. In a future work, it would be of interest to study the function $\text{nrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$, which likely has many similar properties.

The initial non-repetitive complexity also bears some resemblance to the quantity $R'_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$, which is the length of the shortest prefix of $\mathbf{x}$ that contains at least one occurrence of *every* length- n factor of $\mathbf{x}$ [2]. There is also a connection (which we shall make use of later) to the concept of a word with *grouped factors*, which was studied by Cassaigne [9].

In the remainder of this paper, we will give some general properties of the initial non-repetitive complexity function in comparison to the usual complexity function. We will also give explicit formulas for the initial non-repetitive complexity of some of the classical infinite words, namely, the Thue-Morse word

(**m**), the Fibonacci word (**f**) and the Tribonacci word (**t**). Finally we examine the possible range of values that the initial non-repetitive complexity function can take for squarefree words. We attempt to construct squarefree words with slowly growing initial non-repetitive complexity functions. This is somewhat similar to the notion of a *highly repetitive word* [18].

2. Preliminaries

Let Σ denote a finite *alphabet* and let Σ^* denote the set of finite words over Σ . Let $\{0, 1\}$ be the alphabet in the case of the Thue–Morse and Fibonacci words and let the alphabet be $\{0, 1, 2\}$ for the Tribonacci word. If $\theta : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ is a morphism, then $\theta^r(u)$ for a non-negative integer r and a word u is obtained by applying the morphism θ to u r times (we define $\theta^0(u) = u$). By convention, we denote the string of length 0 by ϵ . A word y is a *factor* of a word x if x can be written as $x = uyv$ for some words u and v . If x is a word (finite or infinite) we let $x[i \dots j]$ denote the factor of x of length $j - i + 1$ that starts at position i in x . We denote the length of any finite word u by $|u|$. For any letter a , we denote the number of occurrences of a in u by $|u|_a$.

A word $x = x_1 \dots x_n$ has *period* p if $x_i = x_{i+p}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - p$. An infinite word $\mathbf{w}$ is *ultimately periodic* if $\mathbf{w} = uvvvv \dots$ for some words u and v . If $u = \epsilon$ then $\mathbf{w}$ is *periodic*. If $\mathbf{w}$ is not ultimately periodic then it is *aperiodic*. If every factor of $\mathbf{w}$ occurs infinitely often in $\mathbf{w}$ then $\mathbf{w}$ is *recurrent*.

If $\mathbf{w} = a\theta(s)\theta^2(s)\theta^3(s)$, where $\theta : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ is a morphism, $a \in \Sigma$, $s \in \Sigma^*$, and $\theta(a) = as$, then $\mathbf{w}$ is *pure morphic*. The *adjacency matrix* associated with a morphism θ is the matrix M with rows and columns indexed by elements of Σ such that the ij entry of M equals $|\theta(j)|_i$.

A *square* is a non-empty word of the form xx , and a *cube* is a non-empty word of the form xxx . More generally, if u is a word with period p , then we say that u is an α -*power*, where $\alpha = |u|/p$. An *overlap* is a word of the form $axaxa$, where a is a letter and x is a word (possibly empty). A word is *squarefree* (resp. *cube-free*, *overlap-free*) if none of its factors are squares (resp. cubes, overlaps).

For any real number α , we say that an infinite word is α -powerfree if for all $\beta \geq \alpha$, none of its factors are β -powers. A *palindrome* is a word that equals its reversal.

Let μ be the *Thue-Morse morphism* defined by $\mu(0) = 01$, $\mu(1) = 10$. Clearly $|\mu(u)| = 2|u|$ for any factor u of m . We define the *Thue-Morse word* as $\mathbf{m} = \mu^\omega(0)$. If $u = x_1x_2 \cdots x_s$ is a word over $\{0, 1\}$ for some positive integer s , then we define $\bar{u}$ by $\bar{u} = y_1y_2 \cdots y_s$ where $y_i = 1 - x_i$.

Let x be a finite or infinite word. A factor v of x is *left special* (resp. *right special*) if there are distinct letters a and b such that va and vb (resp. av and bv) are factors of x . A factor v of x is *bispecial* if it is both left special and right special. An infinite word is *Sturmian* if it contains exactly $n + 1$ factors of length n for every $n \geq 0$. A Sturmian word is *standard* if each of its prefixes is left special.

Let ϕ be the *Fibonacci morphism* defined by $\phi(0) = 01$, $\phi(1) = 0$. We define the *Fibonacci word* as $\mathbf{f} = \phi^\omega(0)$. We define $f_k = \phi^k(0)$. We define the *Fibonacci sequence* as $F_0 = 1$, $F_1 = 2$ and $F_k = F_{k-1} + F_{k-2}$ for $k \geq 2$. Note that $|f_k| = F_k$ and that $f_k = f_{k-1}f_{k-2}$ (that is, f_k is the concatenation of f_{k-1} with f_{k-2}). Also note that the Fibonacci word is a standard Sturmian word.

Let σ be the *Tribonacci morphism* defined by $\sigma(0) = 01$, $\sigma(1) = 02$, $\sigma(2) = 0$. We define the *Tribonacci word* as $\mathbf{t} = \sigma^\omega(0)$. We define $t_k = \sigma^k(0)$. We define the *Tribonacci sequence* as $T_0 = 1$, $T_1 = 2$, $T_2 = 4$ and $T_k = T_{k-1} + T_{k-2} + T_{k-3}$ for $k \geq 3$. Also, we define $t_{-1} = 2$ and $T_{-1} = 1$. Note that $|t_k| = T_k$ and that $t_k = t_{k-1}t_{k-2}t_{k-3}$. We define $D_k = t_{k-1}t_{k-2} \cdots t_2t_1t_0$ for $k \geq 1$. By convention, we define $D_0 = \epsilon$.

3. Some general properties of initial non-repetitive complexity

Recall that the complexity function $c_{\mathbf{w}}(n)$ satisfies $c_{\mathbf{w}}(n) > n$ for any aperiodic word $\mathbf{w}$. This is not necessarily true for the initial non-repetitive complexity function. Nevertheless, the initial non-repetitive complexity must grow at least linearly for any aperiodic word $\mathbf{w}$. Note also that the initial non-repetitive

complexity is non-decreasing.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathbf{w}$ be an infinite word and let φ be the golden ratio. The following are equivalent.*

1. $\mathbf{w}$ is ultimately periodic.
2. $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{w}}(n)$ is bounded.
3. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{w}}(n)}{n} = 0$.
4. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{w}}(n)}{n} < \frac{1}{1 + \varphi^2}$.

Proof. The implications $1 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 4$ are straightforward. We prove $4 \Rightarrow 1$. Let $\varepsilon < 1/(1 + \varphi^2)$ and suppose that there exists N such that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{w}}(n) < \varepsilon n$ for all $n \geq N$. Suppose further that N satisfies $\lceil (1 + \varphi^2)\varepsilon(N + 1) \rceil < N$. For each $n \geq N$, there exist integers i_n and j_n satisfying $0 \leq i_n < j_n \leq \varepsilon n$ such that $\mathbf{w}[i_n \dots i_n + n - 1] = \mathbf{w}[j_n \dots j_n + n - 1]$. Define $p_n = j_n - i_n$ and note that $\mathbf{w}[i_n \dots i_n + n - 1]$ has period $p_n \leq \varepsilon n$. Define discrete intervals $I_n = [i_n + \lceil \varphi^2 p_n \rceil, i_n + n - 1]$. For every $i \in I_n$, the prefix $\mathbf{w}[0 \dots i - 1]$ ends with a φ^2 -power. Moreover, since

$$i_{n+1} + \lceil \varphi^2 p_{n+1} \rceil \leq \varepsilon(n+1) + \lceil \varphi^2 \varepsilon(n+1) \rceil \leq \lceil (1 + \varphi^2)\varepsilon(n+1) \rceil + 1 \leq n \leq i_n + n,$$

we have $\cup_{n \geq N} I_n = [i_N + \lceil \varphi^2 p_N \rceil, \infty]$. Thus, for every $i \geq i_N + \lceil \varphi^2 p_N \rceil$, the prefix $\mathbf{w}[0 \dots i - 1]$ ends with a φ^2 -power. Mignosi, Restivo, and Salemi [16, Theorem 2] showed that this implies that $\mathbf{w}$ is ultimately periodic, as required. $\square$

This result gives an interesting new characterization of ultimate periodicity. Later (Theorems 6 and 10) we shall compute the initial non-repetitive complexity function for the Thue–Morse word $\mathbf{m}$ and the Fibonacci word $\mathbf{f}$. These results imply

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(n)}{n} = 3$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{f}}(n)}{n} = 1.$$

One may therefore reasonably wonder if the constant $1/(1 + \varphi^2)$ is optimal in Theorem 1, or if it could perhaps be replaced by 1.

Next we show that there are infinite words whose initial non-repetitive complexity is maximal. First, recall that for any alphabet of size q and any n there exists a (non-cyclic) q -ary de Bruijn sequence of order n , that is, a word of length $q^n + n - 1$ that contains every q -ary word of length n as a factor (see [15]). A *cyclic* q -ary de Bruijn sequence of order n is a word B_n of length q^n that contains every q -ary word of length n as a *circular factor*. Here by circular factor we mean a factor of some cyclic shift of B_n .

Proposition 2.

(a) Over any alphabet of size $q \geq 3$ there exists an infinite word $\mathbf{w}$ satisfying

$$\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{w}}(n) = q^n$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

(b) Over a binary alphabet there exists an infinite word $\mathbf{w}$ satisfying

$$\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{w}}(2n) = 2^{2n}$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Proof. This is a consequence of a result of Iványi (part (a) only) [13] or Becher and Heiber [5] (both parts). They showed that over alphabets of size at least three 3 any (non-cyclic) de Bruijn sequence of order n can be extended to a de Bruijn sequence of order $n + 1$. Taking the limit of such extensions gives an infinite word with the desired property. Curiously, over a binary alphabet, de Bruijn sequences of order n cannot be extended to order $n + 1$, but can be extended to give de Bruijn sequences of order $n + 2$. $\square$

Next we explore the relationship (if any) between the factor complexity and initial non-repetitive complexity functions. The next result shows that there are infinite words with maximal factor complexity but only linear initial non-repetitive complexity.

Proposition 3. *Let $q > 1$ and let B_n denote a cyclic q -ary de Bruijn sequence of order n starting with n 0's. Then*

$$\mathbf{x} = 0^{q^{q^1}} B_1 0^{q^{q^2}} B_2 0^{q^{q^3}} B_3 \dots$$

is an infinite word with complexity q^n and initial non-repetitive complexity $\leq 4n$ for $n \geq 1$.

Proof. Since B_n contains every q -ary word of length n as a circular factor, having at least $n - 1$ 0's follow each B_n ensures that every q -ary word of length n shows up in $\mathbf{x}$. Thus $\mathbf{x}$ has complexity q^n for all positive n . The factor of length $n < q^{q^k}$ starting at the first position of the factor $0^{q^{q^k}}$ consists of n 0's. The factor of length n starting at the second 0 of $0^{q^{q^k}}$ also consists of n 0's. It follows that if $n < q^{q^k}$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$ must be less or equal to the length of the prefix of x ending just before the second 0 of the $0^{q^{q^k}}$ substring. That length is $(q^{q^{k-1}} + q^{q^{k-2}} + \dots + q^{q^1}) + (q^{k-1} + q^{k-2} + \dots + q^1) + 1$ for $k \geq 2$. It follows that if $q^{q^{k-1}} \leq n < q^{q^k}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^{q^i} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^i + 1 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{q^{k-1}} q^i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^i + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{q - q^{q^{k-1}+1}}{1 - q} + \frac{q - q^k}{1 - q} + 1 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{q}{q-1} \right) (q^{q^{k-1}} + q^{k-1} - 2) + 1 \\ &\leq 2(2n - 2) + 1 \\ &\leq 4n. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that if $n < q^q$ then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) = 1$, which completes the proof. $\square$

The previous result showed that there can be a dramatic difference between the behaviours of the factor complexity function and the initial non-repetitive complexity function. Next we show what kind of separation is possible for these

two functions when we restrict our attention to pure morphic words. It is well-known that pure morphic words have $O(n^2)$ factor complexity [3].

Define the morphism ϕ by $\phi(0) = 001$, $\phi(1) = 1$ and let $\mathbf{x} = \phi^\omega(0)$. It is known that $\mathbf{x}$ has $\Theta(n^2)$ factor complexity (see, for instance, [6, Example 4.7.67]).

Lemma 4. *For all $k \geq 0$, the word $\mathbf{x}$ has the prefix zz , where $|z| = 2^{k+1} - 1$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{x}$ begins with 00, it begins with $\phi^k(0)\phi^k(0)$ for all $k \geq 0$. Thus we may take $z = \phi^k(0)$. It remains to show that $|z| = 2^{k+1} - 1$.

Let $M = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ be the adjacency matrix associated with ϕ . Then an easy induction shows that $M^k = \begin{bmatrix} 2^k & 0 \\ 2^k - 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ for $k \geq 0$. Now we have

$$|z| = |\phi^k(0)| = |\phi^k(0)|_0 + |\phi^k(0)|_1 = 2^k + 2^k - 1 = 2^{k+1} - 1,$$

as required. $\square$

Proposition 5. $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) < 2n$ for $n \geq 1$.

Proof. From Lemma 4, we have that if $n \leq 2^{k+1} - 1$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2^{k+1} - 1$. It follows that if $2^k - 1 < n \leq 2^{k+1} - 1$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2^{k+1} - 1 \leq 2(2^k) - 1 \leq 2n - 1 < 2n$. $\square$

4. Initial non-repetitive complexity of the Thue–Morse word

We now begin to compute explicitly the initial non-repetitive complexity functions for some of the classical infinite words, beginning with the Thue–Morse word. Recall that the Thue–Morse word is the word $\mathbf{m} = \mu^\omega(0)$, where $\mu(0) = 01$ and $\mu(1) = 10$.

Theorem 6. *If $2^{k-1} < n \leq 2^k$ for $k \geq 1$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(n) = 3(2^{k-1})$.*

The proof of the theorem will follow from the following lemmas. First note that it follows easily from the definition of μ that if A is a prefix of $\mathbf{m}$ of length 2^k for $k \geq 0$, then $\mu(A) = A\overline{A}$.

Proposition 7. *If $n \leq 2^k$ for $k \geq 1$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(n) \leq 3(2^{k-1})$.*

Proof. We show that $\mathbf{m}[0 \dots 2^k - 1] = \mathbf{m}[2^k + 2^{k-1} \dots 2^{k+1} + 2^{k-1} - 1]$. Let $A = \mathbf{m}[0 \dots 2^{k-1} - 1]$. Then $\mu^3(A) = \mu^2(A\bar{A}) = \mu(A\bar{A}\bar{A}A) = A\bar{A}\bar{A}A\bar{A}\bar{A}A\bar{A}$ is a prefix of $\mathbf{m}$. Since $|A| = 2^{k-1}$, then $A\bar{A} = \mathbf{m}[0 \dots 2^k - 1]$ and $A\bar{A} = \mathbf{m}[2^k + 2^{k-1} \dots 2^{k+1} + 2^{k-1} - 1]$. The upper bound for $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(n)$ follows immediately. $\square$

We make use of the next result to obtain a matching lower bound.

Lemma 8. *[3, Example 10.10.3] For any integer $k \geq 2$, each factor of $\mathbf{m}$ of length $2^{k-1} + 1$ occurs in the prefix of $\mathbf{m}$ of length 2^{k+1} . Furthermore, each one of these factors occurs exactly once in this prefix.*

Proposition 9. *If $2^{k-1} < n$ for $k \geq 2$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(n) \geq 3(2^{k-1})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 8, the first $2^{k+1} - (2^{k-1} + 1) + 1 = 3(2^{k-1})$ factors of length $2^{k-1} + 1$ appearing in $\mathbf{m}$ are all distinct. Consequently the first $3(2^{k-1})$ length- n factors appearing in $\mathbf{m}$ must also be distinct. $\square$

Using Propositions 7 and 9 and that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(2) = 3$ (obtained through observation), we get Theorem 6 and thus the proof is complete. Though the theorem is not defined for $n = 1$, please note that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(1) = 2$.

5. Initial non-repetitive complexity of the Fibonacci word

Recall that the Fibonacci word is the word $\mathbf{f} = \phi^\omega(0)$, where $\phi(0) = 01$ and $\phi(1) = 0$.

Theorem 10. *If $F_{k-1} \leq n + 1 < F_k$ for $k \geq 2$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{f}}(n) = F_{k-1}$.*

We first need some preliminary results. Recall that $f_k = \phi^k(0)$.

Lemma 11. *[14, Chapter 2] For $k \geq 2$, the words $f_k = f_{k-1}f_{k-2}$ and $f_{k-2}f_{k-1}$ differ only by their last two letters.*

Proposition 12. *If $n + 1 < F_k$ for $k \geq 2$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{f}}(n) \leq F_{k-1}$.*

Proof. We show that for any positive integer $k \geq 2$,

$$\mathbf{f}[0 \dots F_k - 3] = \mathbf{f}[F_{k-1} \dots F_{k+1} - 3].$$

We know $f_{k+1} = f_k f_{k-1} = f_{k-1} f_{k-2} f_{k-1}$ is a prefix of f . By Lemma 11, $\mathbf{f}[0 \dots F_k - 1]$ and $\mathbf{f}[F_{k-1} \dots F_{k+1} - 1]$ agree up to but not including the last two positions. The result follows. $\square$

Furthermore, the Fibonacci word is a standard Sturmian word, so for $k \geq 1$, $f_k = u_k r s$, where $rs = 01$ if k is odd or $rs = 10$ if k is even. The u_k 's are known as *central words* and it is known that these central words are palindromes and are bispecial (see [14, Chapter 2]).

A *semicentral word* [8] is a word in which the longest repeated prefix, longest repeated suffix, longest left special factor and longest right special factor are all the same word. Furthermore, this prefix/suffix/bispecial factor is a central word.

Lemma 13. [10, Proposition 16] *The semicentral prefixes of a standard Sturmian word are precisely the words of the form $u_k r s u_k$ for $k \geq 1$.*

The property described in the next lemma is the property of having *grouped factors*, which was mentioned in the introduction.

Lemma 14. [9, Corollary 1] *A sequence is Sturmian if and only if, for $n \geq 0$, it has a factor of length $2n$ containing all factors of length n exactly once. Furthermore, if $n \geq 1$, then there are exactly two such factors of length $2n$, namely $w01v$ and $w10v$, where w is the unique right special factor of length $n - 1$ and v is the unique left special factor of length $n - 1$.*

Proposition 15. *If $F_{k-1} \leq n + 1$ for $k \geq 2$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{f}}(n) \geq F_{k-1}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for $n = F_{k-1} - 1$, the first F_{k-1} factors of $\mathbf{f}$ of length n are all distinct. We know from Lemma 13 that the Fibonacci word has the prefix $u_{k-1} r s u_{k-1}$ where $rs = 01$ or $rs = 10$. Since these prefixes are of the same construction as the factors detailed in Lemma 14 (u_{k-1} is the left and right special factor of length $n - 1$), and since

$$|u_{k-1} r s u_{k-1}| = 2|u_{k-1} r| = 2(F_{k-1} - 1) = 2n,$$

it follows that this semicentral prefix contains all factors of length n exactly once. Thus for all $n \geq F_{k-1} - 1$, all factors of length n are distinct over the first $2(F_{k-1} - 1)$ positions and so the result follows. $\square$

Using Propositions 12 and 15, we get Theorem 10 and thus the proof is complete.

6. Initial non-repetitive complexity of the Tribonacci word

Recall that the Tribonacci word is the word $\mathbf{t} = \sigma^\omega(0)$, where $\sigma(0) = 01$, $\sigma(1) = 02$, and $\sigma(2) = 0$.

Theorem 16. *If $\frac{T_k + T_{k-2} - 3}{2} < n \leq \frac{T_{k+1} + T_{k-1} - 3}{2}$ for $k \geq 1$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{t}}(n) = T_k$.*

We first need to recall some known properties of the Tribonacci word. Recall that $t_k = \sigma^k(0)$ and that $D_k = t_{k-1}t_{k-2} \cdots t_2t_1t_0$ for $k \geq 1$.

Lemma 17. *[20, Theorem 2.5] For $k \geq 2$, the longest common prefix of $t_{k-3}t_{k-1}t_{k-2}$ and t_k is D_{k-2} .*

Lemma 18. *[20, Proposition 2.9] For $k \geq 1$, $|D_k| = \frac{T_{k+1} + T_{k-1} - 3}{2}$.*

Lemma 19. *For any positive integer $k \geq 2$,*

$$\mathbf{t} \left[0 \dots \frac{T_{k+1} + T_{k-1} - 3}{2} - 1 \right] = \mathbf{t} \left[T_k \dots T_k + \frac{T_{k+1} + T_{k-1} - 3}{2} - 1 \right].$$

Proof. We know $t_{k+2} = t_{k+1}t_k t_{k-1} = t_k t_{k-1} t_{k-2} t_k t_{k-1} = t_{k-1} t_{k-2} t_{k-3} t_{k-1} t_{k-2} t_k t_{k-1}$ is a prefix of $\mathbf{t}$ for $k \geq 2$. By Lemma 17, we know that $t_{k-3}t_{k-1}t_{k-2}$ agrees with t_k up to the first $|D_{k-2}|$ symbols. It follows that $t_{k-1}t_{k-2}t_{k-3}t_{k-1}t_{k-2}$ agrees with $t_{k-1}t_{k-2}t_k$ up to the first $|D_k|$ symbols. Since $t_{k-1}t_{k-2}t_k = \mathbf{t}[T_k \dots T_k + T_{k+1} - 1]$, the result follows from Lemma 18. $\square$

We therefore have the following.

Proposition 20. *If $n \leq \frac{T_{k+1} + T_{k-1} - 3}{2}$ for $k \geq 2$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{t}}(n) \leq T_k$.*

Before proving the lower bound for $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{t}}(n)$, we need some additional properties of the Tribonacci word.

Lemma 21. [19, Proof of Proposition 3.3] *The bispecial factors of $\mathbf{t}$ are precisely the palindromic prefixes of $\mathbf{t}$. Furthermore, the lengths of these (nonempty) prefixes are $\frac{T_{k+2}+T_k-3}{2}$ for $k \geq 0$.*

Lemma 22. [20, Lemma 2.3] *If w is a palindrome, then $\sigma(w)0$ is a palindrome.*

Lemma 23. *If w is a palindromic prefix of $\mathbf{t}$ of length $|D_k|$ for $k \geq 1$, then $\sigma(w)0$ is a palindromic prefix of $\mathbf{t}$ of length $|D_{k+1}|$.*

Proof. We know from Lemma 21 that all palindromic prefixes of $\mathbf{t}$ are of length $|D_k|$ for $k \geq 1$. If w is a palindromic prefix of $\mathbf{t}$ of length $|D_k|$, then clearly $\sigma(w)$ is a prefix of $\mathbf{t}$. Furthermore, since w starts with a 0 and is a palindrome, it ends with a 0. So $\sigma(w)$ ends with a 1. Since strings 11 and 12 are not in $\mathbf{t}$, then $\sigma(w)$ must be followed by a 0. Thus, $\sigma(w)0$ is a prefix of $\mathbf{t}$ and we know from Lemma 22 that it is a palindrome. Applying the morphism σ to w will at most double the length. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
|\sigma(w)0| &\leq 2|w| + 1 \\
&= 2 \left(\frac{T_{k+1} + T_{k-1} - 3}{2} \right) + 1 \\
&= \frac{2T_{k+1} + 2T_{k-1} - 4}{2} \\
&< \frac{T_{k+2} + T_{k+1} + T_k + T_k + T_{k-1} + T_{k-2} - 3}{2} \\
&= \frac{T_{k+3} + T_{k+1} - 3}{2} \\
&= |D_{k+2}|.
\end{aligned}$$

So the only option for the length of $\sigma(w)0$ is $|D_{k+1}|$. □

Lemma 24. *If w is a (nonempty) palindromic prefix of $\mathbf{t}$, then the first symbols that follow each of the first two occurrences of w in $\mathbf{t}$ are different.*

Proof. By induction on k where $|w| = |D_k|$. Since $\mathbf{t} = 0102\dots$, the result holds for $k = 1$. Assume that the first symbol that follows each of the first two occurrences of w are different where $|w| = |D_k|$. Since 21 and 22 are not factors of $\mathbf{t}$, each of these occurrences of w are followed by different words among 0, 1,

and 20. Now, since $\sigma(w0) = \sigma(w)01$, $\sigma(w1) = \sigma(w)02$, and $\sigma(w20) = \sigma(w)001$, we see that the first two occurrences of $\sigma(w)0$ are followed by different symbols. Since $|\sigma(w)0| = |D_{k+1}|$ by Lemma 23, this implies that the statement holds for $k + 1$ and thus the statement holds for all k by induction. $\square$

The following is a well-known property of $\mathbf{t}$.

Lemma 25. *There is a unique left special factor and a unique right special factor of each length in $\mathbf{t}$.*

Lemma 26. *Let v denote the prefix of length $|D_{k-1}|$ of $\mathbf{t}$ for $k \geq 2$. All the factors of length $|D_{k-1}|$ that start between the beginning of the first occurrence of v and the beginning of the third occurrence of v are distinct (except for v).*

Proof. Firstly, since $\mathbf{t}$ is recurrent, we know that there are three occurrences of v in $\mathbf{t}$. For the sake of contradiction, assume the factor $u (\neq v)$ of length $|D_{k-1}|$ has two occurrences in $\mathbf{t}$ before we reach the first symbol of the third occurrence of v . For simplicity, let v_j denote the j th occurrence of v and u_i the i th occurrence of u . If the starting symbol of u_i is between the starting symbol of v_j and v_{j+1} , then we will denote that by $v_j < u_i < v_{j+1}$.

Case 1: $v_1 < u_1 < u_2 < v_2$.

If u_1 and u_2 are preceded by different symbols, then u is a left special factor. This is a contradiction since $u \neq v$ and v is the unique left special factor of length $|D_{k-1}|$ in $\mathbf{t}$. Thus, assume they are preceded by the same symbol. Then we obtain another factor (formed by the first $|D_{k-1}| - 1$ symbols of u and the symbol preceding u_1), which we will call r , of length $|D_{k-1}|$ such that $v_1 < r_1 < r_2 < v_2$. Once again, if r_1 and r_2 are preceded by different symbols then we obtain a contradiction. By repeating this argument we eventually find that $v_1 < v_j < u_2$ for some j , which contradicts our original assumption.

Case 2: $v_2 < u_1 < u_2 < v_3$.

Similar to Case 1.

Case 3: $v_1 < u_1 < v_2 < u_2 < v_3$.

We apply the same argument as in Case 1. We either obtain the same contradiction described in that case, or we find that the factor starting with the first symbol of v_1 and ending with the last symbol of u_1 is identical to the factor starting with the first symbol of v_2 and ending with the last symbol of u_2 . This is a contradiction since the symbols following v_1 and v_2 are different by Lemma 24.

In all three cases we obtain a contradiction. Thus all the factors of length $|D_{k-1}|$ (except v) are distinct. $\square$

Lemma 27. *Let $k \geq 2$. All factors of $\mathbf{t}$ of length $|D_{k-1}| + 1$ that begin prior to the third occurrence of the prefix of $\mathbf{t}$ of length $|D_{k-1}|$ are distinct.*

Proof. It is a direct result of Lemmas 24 and 26. $\square$

Lemma 28. *[11, Section 6.3.5] If a square xx is a factor of $\mathbf{t}$, then $|x| \in \{T_k, T_k + T_{k-1}\}$ for some $k \geq 1$.*

Lemma 29. *If a word v of length $|D_{k-1}|$ for $k \geq 5$ overlaps itself in $\mathbf{t}$, then the shortest period of v is at least T_{k-2} .*

Proof. The largest Tribonacci number or sum of consecutive Tribonacci numbers less than T_{k-2} is $T_{k-3} + T_{k-4}$. Let $v = xax$ be a factor of $\mathbf{t}$ of length $|D_{k-1}|$, where x is a nonempty factor of $\mathbf{t}$ and a is a possibly empty factor of $\mathbf{t}$. Suppose that $\mathbf{t}$ contains the overlap $axaxax$. Note that $|xa|$ is a period of v . Also, $|xa| < |D_{k-1}|$ and $2|xa| \geq |D_{k-1}|$. However, $|D_{k-1}| = T_{k-2} + T_{k-3} + T_{k-4} + \dots + T_0 = 2T_{k-3} + 2T_{k-4} + 2T_{k-5} + T_{k-6} \dots + T_0 > 2(T_{k-3} + T_{k-4})$ for $k \geq 5$. So every period of v must be larger than $T_{k-3} + T_{k-4}$. Thus, from Lemma 28, the shortest period of v is at least T_{k-2} . $\square$

Lemma 30. *If v is a prefix of $\mathbf{t}$ of length $|D_{k-1}|$ for $k \geq 2$, then the second occurrence of v occurs at position T_{k-1} and the third occurs at position T_k .*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{t} = 01020100102010102010\dots$, it can be observed that the statement holds for $k = 2, 3, 4$. Thus, assume for the rest of this proof that $k \geq 5$. By Lemma 19, we already know that the prefix v occurs at position T_{k-1} and

position T_k . If there were an occurrence of v that started somewhere between the beginning of $\mathbf{t}$ and position T_{k-1} of $\mathbf{t}$, then by Lemma 29 (note that $|D_{k-1}| > T_{k-1}$), the start of this occurrence of v must be at distance at least T_{k-2} from the beginning of $\mathbf{t}$ and at distance at least T_{k-2} from position T_{k-1} . This implies that $2T_{k-2} \leq T_{k-1}$ but to the contrary we have $2T_{k-2} = T_{k-2} + T_{k-3} + T_{k-4} + T_{k-5} = T_{k-1} + T_{k-5} > T_{k-1}$. Furthermore, $T_{k-1} + 2T_{k-2} > T_{k-1} + T_{k-2} + T_{k-3} = T_k$. It follows that no occurrence of v can start between the beginning of $\mathbf{t}$ and position T_{k-1} nor can it start anywhere between positions T_{k-1} and T_k . $\square$

Proposition 31. *If $\frac{T_k + T_{k-2} - 3}{2} < n$ for $k \geq 2$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{t}}(n) \geq T_k$.*

Proof. The result follows from Lemmas 27 and 30. $\square$

Using Propositions 20 and 31 and that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{t}}(1) = 2$ (making the theorem hold for $k = 1$), we get Theorem 16 and thus the proof is complete.

7. Initial non-repetitive complexity of squarefree words

In this section we examine the possible behaviour of the initial non-repetitive complexity function for words avoiding squares or cubes. In particular, we attempt to construct words that avoid the desired type of repetition but have initial non-repetitive complexity as low as possible.

Proposition 32.

1. *There is no infinite squarefree word $\mathbf{x}$ that has $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) < 2n$ for all n .*
2. *There is no infinite cubefree word $\mathbf{x}$ that has $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) < \frac{3}{2}n$ for all n .*

Proof. 1. If $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) < 2n$ then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(1) = 1$ and therefore $x = aa \cdots$, a contradiction.

2. If $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) < \frac{3}{2}n$ then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(1) = 1$ and $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(2) \leq 2$. It follows that $x = aaa \cdots$ which is a contradiction. $\square$

Consider the infinite alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. We define the sequence of Zimin words, $Z_0, Z_1, Z_2, \dots$, as follows: $Z_0 = \epsilon$ and $Z_{n+1} = Z_n n Z_n$ for $n \geq 0$. Let

$$\mathbf{x} = 0102010301020104 \dots,$$

also known as the *ruler sequence*, be the limit of the Z_n .

Theorem 33. *The infinite word $\mathbf{x}$ is squarefree and satisfies $n < \text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2n$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. For the squarefreeness of $\mathbf{x}$ see [12]. By the definition of $\mathbf{x}$, if $n \leq 2^k - 1$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2^k$ for $k \geq 1$. It follows that if $2^{k-1} \leq n < 2^k$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2^k \leq 2(2^{k-1}) \leq 2n$ for all n . Also, since $\mathbf{x}$ is square-free, clearly $n < \text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$ for all n . $\square$

So we can obtain an infinite squarefree word over an infinite alphabet that has $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2n$ for all n . Furthermore, for this word there are infinitely many values of n such that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) = 2n$.

Using an infinite alphabet may seem like “cheating”, so next we examine what can be done over a finite alphabet. We will make use of a morphism $\theta : \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}^* \rightarrow \{a, b, c, d, e\}^*$, which maps squarefree words over an infinite alphabet to squarefree words over an alphabet of size 5. First, let

$$\mathbf{w} = abcacbabcbacabc \dots$$

be the well-known squarefree word obtained by iterating the morphism

$$a \rightarrow abc, \quad b \rightarrow ac, \quad c \rightarrow b.$$

For $i \geq 0$, let W_i be the prefix of $\mathbf{w}$ of length i . We define $\theta(i) = dW_i e W_i$ for all $i \geq 0$. The map θ is squarefree [4, Corollary 1.4]; that is, if u is squarefree, then $\theta(u)$ is squarefree.

Theorem 34. *Let $\mathbf{x}$ be the ruler sequence defined previously. Then $\mathbf{y} = \theta(\mathbf{x})$ is a square-free word with $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{y}}(n) < 3n$ for all n except $n = 2$.*

Proof. It is relatively easy to see that the prefix A of $\mathbf{x}$ of length $2^k - 1$ will have 2^{k-1} 0's, 2^{k-2} 1's, and so on, down to only one occurrence of $k-1$. Furthermore, as a result of how we defined the W_i 's, we have $|\theta(i)| = 2(i+1)$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta(A)| &= 2k + 2(2(k-1)) + 4(2(k-2)) + \cdots + 2^{k-1}(2(1)) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 2^{i+1}(k-i) \\ &= 2^{k+2} - 2k - 4. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if B is the prefix of $\mathbf{x}$ of length 2^k , then

$$|\theta(B)| = |\theta(A)| + 2(k+1) = 2^{k+2} - 2k - 4 + 2k + 2 = 2^{k+2} - 2,$$

since $|\theta(k)| = 2(k+1)$. As a result of the fact (see proof of Theorem 33) that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2^k$ for $2^{k-1} \leq n < 2^k$, if $2^{k+1} - 2(k-1) - 4 < n \leq 2^{k+2} - 2k - 4$, then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{y}}(n) \leq 2^{k+2} - 2$. The expression

$$\frac{2^{k+2} - 2}{2^{k+1} - 2(k-1) - 3}$$

is a decreasing function of k and is less than 3 for $k \geq 4$. Along with the fact that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{y}}(n) < 3n$ for $n \leq 22$ (other than $n = 2$), which can be obtained through computation, we have $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{y}}(n) < 3n$ for all n except $n = 2$. $\square$

It should be noted that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{k+2} - 2}{2^{k+2} - 2k - 4} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{k+2} - 2}{2^{k+1} - 2(k-1) - 3} = 2,$$

meaning that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{y}}(n)}{n} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{y}}(n)}{n} \leq 2.$$

To obtain a result over a 3-letter alphabet we will need a morphism σ (found by Brandenburg [7, Theorem 4]), which maps squarefree words on $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$

to squarefree words on $\{a, b, c\}$. We define it by

$$\sigma(a) = abacabcacbabcbabc$$

$$\sigma(b) = abacabcacbacababc$$

$$\sigma(c) = abacabcacbcababc$$

$$\sigma(d) = abacabcacababc$$

$$\sigma(e) = abacabcacbacabc.$$

Theorem 35. *The word $\mathbf{z} = \sigma(\mathbf{y})$ is square-free and has $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{z}}(n) < 3n$ for all $n > 36$.*

Proof. Since $|\sigma(m)| = 18$ for $m \in \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{y}}(n) \leq 2^{k+2} - 2$ if

$$2^{k+1} - 2(k-1) - 4 < n \leq 2^{k+2} - 2k - 4,$$

then it follows that if

$$18(2^{k+1} - 2(k-1) - 4) < n \leq 18(2^{k+2} - 2k - 4),$$

then $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{z}}(n) \leq 18(2^{k+2} - 2)$. The expression

$$\frac{18(2^{k+2} - 2)}{18(2^{k+1} - 2(k-1) - 4) + 1}$$

is a decreasing function of k and is less than 3 for $k \geq 4$. Along with the fact that $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{z}}(n) \leq 3n$ for $36 < n \leq (18)(22) = 396$, which can be obtained through computation, $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{z}}(n) < 3n$ for all $n > 36$. $\square$

Furthermore, similar to the word $\mathbf{y}$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{18(2^{k+2} - 2)}{18(2^{k+1} - 2k - 4)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{18(2^{k+2} - 2)}{18(2^{k+1} - 2(k-1) - 4) + 1} = 2,$$

meaning that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{z}}(n)}{n} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{z}}(n)}{n} \leq 2.$$

Also note that since the Thue–Morse word is overlap-free, Theorem 6 shows that it is an example of an overlap-free word with $\text{inrc}_{\mathbf{m}}(n) < 3n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

8. Open questions

Question 1. Is the constant $1/(1 + \varphi^2)$ in Theorem 1 best possible? Can it be replaced by 1?

Question 2. For each positive integer d , it is possible to construct an infinite word $\mathbf{x}$ whose initial non-repetitive complexity is $\Theta(n^d)$? What are the possibilities for the usual factor complexity of such a word?

Question 3. Is the word $\mathbf{x}$ of Theorem 33 the only (up to permutation of the infinite alphabet) infinite squarefree word such that $\text{inc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n) \leq 2n$ for all n ?

Question 4. Are the examples given in Section 7 optimal for squarefree words: i.e., are there squarefree words whose initial non-repetitive complexity functions grow even slower than the examples given here?

Question 5. Can results similar to those proved here also be proved for the function $\text{nrc}_{\mathbf{x}}(n)$ defined in the Introduction? A detailed study of this function would be quite interesting.

9. Acknowledgments

The first author is supported by an NSERC USRA, the second by NSERC Discovery Grant #418646-2012. We thank all of the anonymous referees: each of them had several helpful suggestions that improved the quality of this paper.

References

- [1] J.-P. Allouche, M. Baake, J. Cassaigne, D. Damanik, “Palindrome complexity”, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 292 (2003) 9–31.
- [2] J.-P. Allouche, M. Bousquet-Mélou, “On the conjectures of Rauzy and Shallit for infinite words”, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* 36 (1995) 705–711.

- [3] J.-P. Allouche, J. Shallit, *Automatic Sequences: Theory, applications, generalizations*, Cambridge, 2003.
- [4] D. Bean, A. Ehrenfeucht, G. McNulty, “Avoidable patterns in strings of symbols”, *Pacific J. Math.* 85 (1979) 261–294.
- [5] V. Becher, P. Heiber, “On extending de Bruijn sequences”, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 111 (2011) 930–932.
- [6] V. Berthé, M. Rigo, eds., *Combinatorics, Automata and Number Theory*, Cambridge, 2010.
- [7] F. Brandenburg, “Uniformly growing k -th power-free homomorphisms”, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 23 (1983) 69–82.
- [8] M. Bucci, A. De Luca, G. Fici, “Enumeration and structure of trapezoidal words”, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 468 (2013) 12–22.
- [9] J. Cassaigne, “Sequences with grouped factors”, in *DLT 1997*, pp. 211–222, 1997.
- [10] A. De Luca, G. Fici, “Open and closed prefixes of Sturmian words”, in *WORDS 2013*, LNCS 8079, pp. 132–142, 2013.
- [11] A. Glen, *On Sturmian and Episturmian Words, and Related Topics*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Adelaide, 2006.
- [12] M. Guay-Paquet, J. Shallit, “Avoiding squares and overlaps over the natural numbers”, *Discrete Math.* 309 (2009) 6245–6254.
- [13] A. Iványi, “On the d -complexity of words”, *Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest., Sect. Comp.* 8 (1987) 69–90.
- [14] M. Lothaire, *Algebraic Combinatorics on Words*, Cambridge, 2002.
- [15] M. H. Martin, “A problem in arrangements”, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 40 (1934) 859–864.

- [16] F. Mignosi, A. Restivo, S. Salemi, “Periodicity and the golden ratio”, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 204 (1998) 153–167.
- [17] T. K. S. Moothathu, “Eulerian entropy and non-repetitive subword complexity”, Theoret. Comput. Sci 420 (2012) 80–88.
- [18] N. Rampersad, E. Vaslet, “On highly repetitive and power free words”, J. Integer Seq. 16 (2013), Article 13.2.7, 17 pages.
- [19] G. Richomme, K. Saari, L. Q. Zamboni, “Balance and abelian complexity of the Tribonacci word”, Adv. in Appl. Math. 45 (2010) 212–231.
- [20] B. Tan, Z.-Y. Wen, “Some properties of the Tribonacci sequence”, European J. Combinatorics 28 (2007) 1703–1719.